DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 206 SP 037 489

AUTHOR Ellett, Chad D.; Hill, Flo H.; Liu, Xia; Loup, Karen S.; Lakshmanan, Aruna

TITLE Professional Learning Environment and Human Caring Correlates of Teacher Efficacy.

PUB DATE 1997-03-00

NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Public School Teachers; Public Schools; *School Culture; *Self Efficacy; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Motivation; *Teaching Conditions

IDENTIFIERS *Caring

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of a study of relationships between elements of the school professional learning environment and dimensions of caring and efficacy motivation among teachers. The sample for the study consisted of 1009 elementary and secondary school teachers from 29 schools in two suburban/rural school districts in a southeastern state. The teachers completed questionnaires that measured: teachers' perceptions of a range of conditions in schools that stimulate and support professional learning and growth; teachers' personal and organizational levels of efficacy motivation; and four affective components of human caring. The results showed: that measures of the professional learning environments of schools, human caring, and efficacy motivation can be determined with reasonable reliability; that positive relationships exist between elements of the professional learning environment of schools and teacher levels of efficacy motivation related to goal persistence and response to failure; and that a strong relationship exists between good teacher and administrator relationships and opportunities for professional development. These results are important as they relate to theory building, teacher development, and perhaps school improvement. Five data tables are attached. The appendix provides copies of the demographic information form, and copies of The Professional Learning Environment Inventory, The Teacher Self and Organizational Efficacy Assessment, and The Human Caring Inventory. (Contains 11 references.) (JLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 206

Professional Learning Environment and Human Caring Correlates of Teacher Efficacy

Chad D. Ellett
Flo H. Hill
Xia Liu
Louisiana State University

Karen S. Loup
University of Georgia

Aruna Lakshmanan
Louisiana State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. E. Ellett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association
Chicago, Illinois

March 1997

SP037889

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Professional Learning Environment and Human Caring Correlates of Teacher Efficacy

The formal study of learning environments, particularly from the student perspective, has a rich, though rather recent history. Major syntheses of research on learning environments (Fraser, 1986; Fraser, Walberg, Welch, & Hattie, 1987) clearly show that psychosocial characteristics of classroom learning environments demonstrate incremental validity in predicting student achievement, can be cross-culturally replicated, are useful in curriculum evaluation studies and can provide teachers with useful information to arrange more optimally functioning classrooms. More recent literature on the study of learning environments (e.g., see McRobbie & Ellett, 1996) has called for the use of multiple methodologies to assess classroom learning environments, the development and use of constructivist-based measurements, and inclusion of studies of school level learning environments, particularly from teachers' perspectives.

Typically studies of classroom and school level learning environments proceed by seeking to link student and/or teacher perceptions measures with other school-related variables (e.g., student achievement). Few attempts have been made to understand how these perceptions (whether actual or preferred, or measured with class level or personal forms) are linked to personal constructs of students and teachers believed to mediate linkages between perceptions, intentions and behaviors. A recent exception is the work of Loup (1994) in her study of teacher receptivity to change factors, personal and organizational efficacies, and dimensions of the professional learning environment in schools. The psychology of human behavior has traditionally pointed to a large number of personal constructs believed to mediate perceptions, intentions and subsequent behaviors. Among these are recent conceptualizations of human efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Bandura, 1993) and Human Caring (Noddings, 1984; Moffett, 1993).

Such personal constructs are believed to be both derived from human interactions with and perceptions of the functioning environment; and influential in the translation of perceptions into subsequent behavior. Thus, older phenomenological theories of behavior (e.g., Lewin 1947) and more recent summaries of research on perceptions of learning environments (Fraser, 1986, McRobbie & Ellett, 1996), suggest that human perceptions, intentions and subsequent behaviors are mediated by a variety of individual, personal variables.

This study represents an attempt to better understand linkages between teacher perceptions of elements of the professional learning environment in schools, dimensions of human caring and efficacy motivation. The study is the first known study to explore relationships among these variables and the working research hypothesis was that the efficacy motivation of teachers is positively related to their levels of human caring (affective components of caring) and the quality of the professional learning environment in schools. If efficacy levels are situationally specific and derived from experience (Bandura, 1993), then teacher efficacy levels in schools should be positively related to the quality of professional learning opportunities. In addition, since teaching is a helping profession, caring levels of teachers should be linked to efficacy levels of teachers as these relate to enhancing the accomplishment of key school goals (e.g. enhancing the learning of students).

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to present the results of a study of relationships among elements of the school professional learning environment and dimensions of human caring and efficacy motivation among teachers. A secondary purpose is to describe how the results can be used to develop more comprehensive frameworks for understanding adult learning environments

in schools in view of important teacher, personal characteristics.

Methodology

Sample

The sample for the study consisted of 1009 elementary and secondary teachers from 29 schools in two suburban/rural school districts in a southeastern state. Demographics for this teacher sample (e.g., years of employment, age, gender, ethnicity, etc. generally mirrored those of rural/suburban teachers statewide.

Measures

Professional Learning Environment Inventory

The Professional Learning Environment Inventory (PLEI) (Loup, 1994) was originally conceptualized by Loup (1994) as a teacher perceptions measure of activities, events, relationships and conditions in schools that stimulate and support professional learning and growth among teachers. The PLEI consists of 28 items rated on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1="Factor/event does not occur/exist to 4="factor/event almost always occurs/exists." The items comprising the PLEI are distributed over four subscales: Opportunities for Professional Development, Beliefs/Expectations/Values, Teacher/Administrator Relationships, and Teacher Autonomy (Loup, 1994).

Teacher Self and Organizational Efficacy Assessment (TSOEA)

The Teacher Self and Organizational Efficacy Assessment (TSOEA) (Loup, 1994) is an instrument designed to assess teachers' personal (self) and organizational (other teachers) levels of efficacy motivation. The theoretical basis of the TSOEA is found in the work of Bandura (1982; 1993). The TSOEA scales solicit teacher judgements of the extent to

which they are motivated to pursue goals and to persist in overcoming barriers/obstacles to goal accomplishment and response to failure to achieve goals. Four generic goals statements are the focus of the TSOEA: 1) to enhance the learning of students; 2) to increase parent involvement in children's learning; 3) to establish and communicate school vision; and 4) to establish professional relationships with administrators and other teachers.

Human Caring Inventory (HCI-TF)

The Human Caring Inventory - Teacher Form (HCI-TF) (Moffett, 1993) was originally developed for use with nurses and it consists of 36 items designed to measure four affective components of the caring construct: Responsivity (to others), Receptivity, Professional Commitment and Moral/Ethical Consciousness. According to Moffett, affective components of human caring (*caring about*) can be distinguished from more technical/professional components of the human caring construct (*caring for*).Each item on the HCI-TF is judged using a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1=Strongly Agree to 4=Strongly Disagree. Items ask teachers about their beliefs, behaviors and values (e.g., "It is important for students to know that the teacher cares about them"). The HCI-TF instrument also included six items selected form the Crowne/Marlowe scales (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) as a check on the social desirability of teacher responses (e.g., "I have sometimes taken unfair advantage of another person"). For this study, the HCI form for nurses was adapted for teachers by changing the word *patient(s) to student(s).*

A complete copy of the PLEI, the TSOEA and the HCI-TF measures can be found ih Appendix A.

Data Collection Procedures

Data for the study were collected during the spring of 1996. Individual teacher instrument packets were prepared and distributed within schools to each teacher. Confidentiality of individual teachers was assured and only schools were identified for research purposes. Teachers were given from 7 to 10 days to complete the entire instrument packet. Completed materials were returned to a neutral data collector (e.g., school librarian) in a sealed envelope and then mailed/delivered to the researchers for data entry and processing. Teachers in one entire district completed the complete instrument packet. In the second district, teachers in nine schools completed only the HCI-TF measure.

Data Analyses

A variety of data analyses was completed on the PLEI/TSOEA/HCI-TF data set. These included descriptive statistics for the sample and for the various measures, extensive factor analyses for each measure, Cronbach Alpha reliabilities for each measure's subscales, Pearson product moment correlations among subscales using school means and individual teachers as the units of analysis, and a series of multiple regression analyses regressing the teacher efficacy measure on subscales of the PLEI and HCI-TF.

Results

Sample Statistics

Table 1 presents a summary of demographic information on the sample of teachers. By way of summary, the following percentages characterized demographics for the respondents: Male (14.5%) and Female (85.1%). African American (5.6%), Caucasian (91%) and Other (3.4%). Multiple grade levels were taught by 38.5% of the teacher respondents, 39.2% taught a single

grade between K and 6, 12.9% taught a single grade between 7 and 9, and 5.6% taught a single grade between 10 and 12. The respondents' teaching experience in years was distributed as follows: 1-5 years (20.8%), 6-10 years (20.9%), 11-15 years (15.9%), 16-20 years (18.6%), and more than 20 years (24.8%). Two teachers did not have a Bachelor degree, 60.9% had a Bachelor degree, 17.5% had a Master degree, 17.9% had a Master degree with additional graduate work, 1.7% had a specialist degree, 5 had a doctoral degree.

Factor Analyses

Extensive factor analyses were completed for each of the three instruments. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these results in detail so only summaries of findings are described in the sections that follow. Procedurally, a principal components (factor) analysis with orthogonal rotation was completed for the PLEI and the TSOEA measures. Results of these analyses identified four measurement dimensions for the PLEI that accounted for 51.7% of the total variance in the solution. The four factors originally identified by Loup (1994) (see above) were generally replicated with some mixing of item/subscale loadings. The factored PLEI subscales from these analyses were termed: Teacher and Administrator Relations (TAR), Opportunities for Professional Development (OPD), Autonomy (AUT), and Opportunities for Learning (OL). Alpha reliabilities for these factored PLEI scales ranged from .61 (OL) to .89 (TAR) (see Table 2).

A similar analysis with the TSOEA identified two salient, teacher collective efficacy factors accounting for 61.3% of the item variance with Alpha reliabilities of .97 (MEB) (Motivation/Energy/Persistence in Overcoming Barriers) and .94 (RF) (Response to Repeated Failure) (see Table 2). Principal components analyses with oblique rotation of the HCI-TF data

identified four human caring dimensions with some mixing of original item/scale alignment reasonably consistent with those previously identified by Moffett (1993) that accounted for 39.1% of the item variance. The four scales identified were termed Moral/Ethical Consciousness (MEC), Professional Commitment (PC), Responsivity (RESP), and Receptivity (RECP). Alpha reliabilities for these four factored subscales were as follows: MEC (.63), PC (.85), RESP (.55, (RECP) (.49) (see table 2). Table 2 also includes the results of the variance explained by each factored subscale for each of the three measures.

Descriptive Statistics for Measurement Scales

Table 3 contains a summary of descriptive statistics for each of the factored subscales for the three measures. Included in the table for each scale are the mean, standard deviation, and mean expressed as a percentage of the maximum possible score. The number of items comprising each factored subscale is also provided in Table 3. The mean expressed as a percentage of the maximum possible score index allows for a rough comparison of the various subscale scores for the three measures given that the number of items comprising the various subscales differs from one to the next. The highest scores for this sample of teachers were for the Professional Learning Environment Inventory (PLEI) Autonomy (AUT) subscale (85.98%) and the Human Caring Inventory Moral/Ethical Consciousness (MEC) subscale (84.02%). The lowest scores were for the PLEI Opportunities for Learning (OL) subscale (44.1%) and the Response to Failure (RF) subscale of the TSOEA (57.7%).

Bivariate Correlations

Table 4 presents a summary of Pearson product moment intercorrelations among the factored subscales of the three study measures using individual teachers as the unit of analysis.

These intercorrelations clearly show that the TSOEA was more strongly related to the professional learning environment measures than to the human caring measures. Correlation coefficients for the teacher persistence/motivation efficacy measure (MEB) of the TSOEA and teacher perceptions of the professional learning environment (PLEI) were all statistically significant ($p<.01$) and ranged in magnitude from .23 to .47. The TSOEA Response to Failure (RF) subscale was not statistically related to any of the other subscales (including the MEB subscale of the TSOEA). Significant, positive, but more moderate correlations were established between the HCI-TF subscales and the MEB subscale of the TSOEA and the HCI-TF and PLEI subscales.

Intercorrelations among the HCI-TF subscales were all positive in direction, moderate in magnitude and statistically significant. These intercorrelations were higher than the intercorrelations among the PLEI subscales which is to be expected given the different factor analysis procedures used to identify the subscales (i.e., oblique rotation for the HCI-TF and orthogonal rotation for the PLEI). These coefficients provide evidence of the discriminant validity of the HCI-TF and PLEI subscales.

Regression Analyses

Table 5 summarizes the results of a stepwise multiple regression of the efficacy motivation variable (MEB) on the PLEI and HCI-TF subscales. The results in the table show (in order of equation entry) that two PLEI variables (Opportunities for Professional Learning and Development and Teacher/Administrator Relations) and two HCI-TF variables (Moral/Ethical Consciousness and Professional Commitment) accounted for 33% of the total variation in teacher efficacy motivation ($R=.57$, $p<.0001$). When the efficacy in response to failure (RF) was used

as a dependent variable in a similar analysis, no statistically significant variables ($p<.05$) entered the regression equation. This result, however, was expected since the bivariate correlations with the PLEI and HCI-TF subscales approached zero.

Social desirability in the HCI-TF measure was not considered much of a response validity concern since inter-item correlations among the Crowne/Marlowe and HCI-TF items ranged from .42 to .08 with most values approximating .20.

Discussion

The results of this study are important from a variety of perspectives. First, they demonstrate that measures of the professional learning environment of schools, human caring and efficacy motivation can be measured in an efficient manner with reasonable measurement reliability. The one exception in this study were the rather modest Alpha reliabilities for the RESP and RECP subscales of the Human Caring Inventory. These were lower than desired, but perhaps understandable since the items comprising these subscales were somewhat mixed in the factor analyses completed in this study from their original subscale classifications by Moffett (1993). Remembering that the HCI was originally developed for nurses, these rather modest reliabilities suggest that the HCI-TF factored subscales identified in this study need to be reexamined for use with teachers. Open-ended comments to the data collection packet from some teachers suggested that there may have been lack of clarity in the meaning of a few items comprising the HCI when it was rather directly adapted to teachers.

The low correlations of the social desirability index score with the HCI-TF items provides continuing support that responses to the HCI are not strongly influenced by *halo and fake good effects*. Ellett, Moffett, Rugutt, & Clarke (1996) found similar results with other samples of

teachers, social workers and nurses.

Second, the results document the rather strong positive, however complex relationships that exist between elements of the professional learning environment of schools and teacher levels of efficacy motivation related to goal persistence and response to failure to attain goals. Somewhat at odds with the prior study by Loup (1994), the results reported here suggest that the TSOEA measures two distinct, collective elements of teacher efficacy in schools: 1) motivation/persistence in overcoming barriers; and 2) response to repeated failure. In Loup's (1994) study, three TSOEA factors were identified: a teacher self (personal factor) (*ME*), an other teachers factor (*THEE*), and a collective teacher factor (*WE*). Loup suggested that the third, collective factor represented teacher perceptions that failed to differentiate self from others when considering efficacy motivation behavior in response to failure. In this study, the second factor was similar to Loup's third, collective teacher efficacy factor. However, the results failed to demonstrate a factor similar to Loup's other teachers (*THEE*) factor. Loup's study was conducted in a large, multiculturally diverse, urban school district and the schools in this study were all primarily rural/suburban. Considered together, these results may suggest that teachers' sense of self-efficacy and the efficacy of colleagues differs from one school or perhaps district to the next and that such differences in perceptions are to be expected with strongly contrasting social contexts that surround different classrooms, schools and school districts. A similar argument has also recently been made in comparing work-related efficacy assessments of social workers, teachers and university faculty (Loup, Clark, Ellett, & Rugutt, 1997). This argument makes intuitive sense in view of other findings in this study linking opportunities for professional development and learning to teacher efficacy beliefs. It also makes sense given the rather low

efficacy beliefs scores for this sample of teachers in their perceptions of responses to repeated failure to accomplish important school goals. The collective efficacy results (TSOEA RF scale) for this sample of teachers were considerably below those reported for teachers in Loup's (1994) study.

Third, the strongest relationship established among all of the constructs explored was for the PLEI Opportunities for Professional Development (OPD) and Teacher and Administrator Relations (TAR) subscales ($r=.65$, $p<.001$). This finding makes intuitive sense because opportunities for the professional development of teachers that occur in schools seem best fostered in supportive cultures and interpersonal and professional contexts in which teacher and administrator relationships are positive.

Finally, the results reported in this study are important as they relate to theory building, teacher development and perhaps school improvement. From the theory building perspective the results expand the nomological network of relations with the human efficacy construct central to Bandura's theory of human functioning (Bandura 1982; 1993). The fact that efficacy links to opportunities within schools for professional development and growth and to affective elements of human caring, suggests that teacher efficacy can perhaps be fostered and developed by providing teachers opportunities for new learning and growth related to accomplishing important school goals. This logic is consistent with Bandura's views about efficacy task specificity and the importance of positive learning experiences to the development of human efficacy. Previous studies on teacher efficacy have primarily targeted the classroom level and have been concerned with efficacy as this construct relates to classroom management concerns (e.g., Gibson & Dembo (1984). This study, and the previous study by Loup (1994), place the teacher efficacy construct

within a much larger social context within schools and both studies show important linkages between the opportunities teachers report for professional growth and learning and levels of personal (self) and organizational (collective) efficacy motivation.

Linkages between teachers' levels of human caring and their perceptions of the professional learning environment and efficacy levels in this study, though many were statistically significant, were rather modest in magnitude. It should be recalled here that the reliabilities of the Responsivity and Receptivity subscales of the HCI-TF for these teacher were extremely low, which attenuates (lowers due to unreliability of measurement) these correlations. However, the logic of continuing to examine relationships among these variables in future studies seems sound.

For example, if human caring includes active attentiveness and responsiveness to the needs and feelings of others, it stands to reason that it can be linked to a total motivational system in the helping professions like teaching, social work, counseling, etc. In this sense, increased levels of caring about others should enhance efficacy motivation and persistence of teachers (and others), particularly in overcoming obstacles and barriers (for example student failure in schools). Thus, those who care about others and who have high self-efficacy, would appear to be those who are the most motivated to persist. To the extent that task persistence (e.g., helping students learn in this case) is an element of productivity in accomplishing personal and perhaps group goals, schools that create environments that enhance teacher caring about others, opportunities for professional learning and growth, and high levels of efficacy would predictably be the most effective. Future studies of relationships among these variables in various contexts should provide considerable insights for continued theory development about school learning environments, human efficacy, human caring and school improvement.

References

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 37, 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. Educational Psychologist, 28, (2), 117-148.

Ellett, C.D, Moffett, B.S., Rugutt, J.K., & Clarke J. (1996). Measuring human caring in the helping professions: Instrument development and cross-validation with samples of nurses, social workers, and teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York.

Fraser, B.J. (1986). Classroom environment. London: Croom Helm.

Fraser, B.J., Walberg, H.J., Welch, W.W., & Hattie, J.A. (1987). Syntheses of educational productivity research. International Journal of Educational Research, 11, 145-252.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.

Loup, K.S. (1994). Measuring and linking school professional learning environment characteristics, teacher self and organizational efficacy, receptivity to change, and multiple indices of school effectiveness. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Loup, K.S., Clarke, J.S., Ellett, C.D., & Rugutt, J.K. (1997). Exploring dimensions of personal and organizational efficacy motivation: A study of teachers, social workers and university faculty. Paper presented at the annual meeting of th American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

McRobbbie, C.J., & Ellett, C.D. (1996). Advances in research on educational learning environments. International Journal of Educational Research, Special Edition on the Study of Learning Environments, In Press.

Moffett, B.S. (1993). Development and construct validation of an instrument to measure caring in the helping professions. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Table 1: Summary of Demographic Characteristics for the Sample

ITEM	SUBITEMS	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Gender	Male	146	14.5%
	Female	859	85.1%
	Missing	4	0.4%
Ethnicity	African American	56	5.6%
	Caucasian	918	91.0%
	Hispanic	9	0.9%
	Asian American	3	0.3%
	Native American	10	1.0%
	Other	3	0.3%
	Missing	10	1.0%
Grade Level	K-6	398	39.2%
	7-9	129	12.9%
	10-12	56	5.6%
	Multiple Grades	388	38.5%
	Other	18	1.8%
	Missing	20	2.0%
Teaching Experience	1-5 years	198	20.8%
	6-10 years	208	20.9%
	11-15 years	159	15.9%
	16-20 years	186	18.6%
	Over 20 years	239	24.8%
	Missing	8	0.8%
Highest Education Level Attained	Below Bachelor	2	0.2%
	Bachelor Degree	614	60.9%
	Master Degree	177	17.5%
	Master Degree Plus Additional Graduate Work	181	17.9%
	Specialist Degree	17	1.7%
	Doctoral Degree	5	0.5%
	Missing	13	1.3%

Table 2: Summary of Results of Factor Analyses and Reliabilities of the HCI-TF, PLEI and the TSOEA Measures

INSTRUMENT	SUBSCALES	VARIANCE EXPLAINED	ALPHA RELIABILITY
Human Caring Inventory (HCI-TF)	MEC (7)[1]	21.5	0.63
	PC (6)	8.3	0.85
	RESP(4)	4.8	0.55
	RECP(5)	4.5	0.49
Professional Learning Environment Inventory (PLEI)	TAR (6)	34.2	0.89
	OPD(10)	7.1	0.83
	AUT (3)	5.4	0.76
	OL (4)	4.9	0.61
Teacher Self and Organizational Efficacy Assessment (TSOEA)	MEB (16)	34.3	0.94
	RF (8)	27.0	0.97

[1] Number of items comprising scale

Table 3: Summary of Descriptive Statistics of Factored Subscales of the HCI-TF, PLEI and the TSOEA Measures.

INSTRUMENT	SUBSCALES	MEAN	SD	MEAN % MAX[1]
Human Caring Inventory (HCI-TF)	MEC (7)[2]	23.54	2.63	84.02%
	PC (6)	18.39	3.75	76.63%
	RESP (4)	11.83	2.04	73.93%
	RECP (5)	14.79	2.29	73.93%
Professional Learning Environment Inventory (PLEI)	TAR (6)	17.32	4.58	72.17%
	OPD (10)	30.12	5.65	75.29%
	AUT (3)	10.32	1.80	85.98%
	OL (4)	7.14	2.22	44.61%
Teacher Self and Organizational Efficacy Assessment (TSOEA)	MEB (16)	64.92	10.07	81.15%
	RF (8)	23.08	8.87	57.70%

[1] Mean expressed as a percentage of the maximum possible score.
[2]Number of items comprising scale

Table 4: Summary of Intercorrelations Among the Factored Subscales of the HCI-TF, PLEI and the TSOEA Measures

			HCI-TF				PLEI			TSOEA	
		MEC (7)[1]	PC (6)	RESP (4)	RECP (5)	TAR (6)	OPD (10)	AUT (3)	OL (4)	MEB (16)	RF (8)
HCI-TF	MEC (7)[1]	1.00									
	PC (6)	0.39**	1.00								
	RESP (4)	0.47**	0.38**	1.00							
	RECP (5)	0.46**	0.34**	0.35**	1.00						
PLEI	TAR (6)	0.13**	0.22**	0.12**	0.12**	1.00					
	OPD (10)	0.19**	0.25**	0.16**	0.14**	0.65**	1.00				
	AUT (3)	0.09*	0.11*	0.00	0.08	0.38**	0.34**	1.00			
	OL (4)	0.03	0.16**	0.05	0.02	0.43**	0.51**	0.17**	1.00		
TSOEA	MEB (16)	0.23**	0.25**	0.16**	0.14**	0.47**	0.47**	0.23**	0.30**	1.00	
	RF (8)	0.02	0.03	0.00	-0.06	0.02	-0.01	0.06	-0.04	0.02	1.00

[1] Number of items comprising scale
* $p<0.05$
** $p<0.01$

Table 5: Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis, Regressing Teacher Efficacy Motivation Variable on Subscales of the PLEI and the HCI-TF.

Step	Variable	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F	p
1	OPD	0.51	0.26		201.28	.0001
2	PC	0.54	0.29	0.03	116.52	.0001
3	TAR	0.56	0.31	0.02	87.02	.0001
4	MEC	0.57	0.33	0.02	68.90	.0001

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION PACKET AND STUDY MEASURES

Demographic Information Form
Human Caring Inventory - Teacher Form (HCI-TF)
Professional Learning Environment Inventory (PLEI)
Teacher Self and Organizational Efficacy Assessment (TSOEA)

RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

Directions: Please complete the personal information requested on this form by filling in the spaces provided or by checking (X) the appropriate option for each item. When you have completed this form, please complete all items on the attached Teacher Attitude Inventory. **When returning your completed materials, please make certain they remain stapled together for correct data processing.**

1. **Gender:** Male ____ Female ____

2. **Ethnicity:** African American ____; Caucasian _____; Hispanic ____;
   Asian American ____; Native American ____; Other ____

3. **Grade Level Primarily Taught:** _____ (Specify K - 12 Grade Level)

4. **# of Yrs. Teaching Experience:** _____ (Specify # of Yrs... Include Current Year)

5. **# of Yrs. Teaching in Current School:** _____ (Specify # of Yrs... Include Current Year)

6. **Highest Education Level Attained:**

   Bachelor Degree _____

   Master Degree _____

   Master Degree Plus
   Additional Graduate Work _____

   Specialist Degree _____

   Doctoral Degree _____

7. **Subject(s) Primarily Taught:**

   (List No More Than Two Please. Regular Elementary Teachers Should Enter "Basic Subjects")

   A. _____

   B. _____

NEXT PLEASE COMPLETE THE TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

THAT BEGINS ON THE NEXT PAGE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Directions: This inventory asks about your personal attitudes and beliefs. Read a statement, then use the scale below to select the scale point that best reflects your personal degree of agreement with the statement. Next circle the appropriate number provided to the right of each statement. Be certain to circle only one number for each statement. Please complete both sides of this form. When you have finished all of your responses, return the completed inventory to the individual responsible for collecting inventories in your school. You do not need to include your name on the inventory or to identify your self in any way. Thanks for your assistance.

SCALE: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD); 2=Disagree (D); 3=Agree (A); 4=Strongly Agree (SA)

	Statements	SD	D	A	SA
1.	Students should not question the advice of teachers.	1	2	3	4
2.	My work is worthwhile.	1	2	3	4
3.	New acquaintances find it easy to start conversations with me.	1	2	3	4
4.	I find it easy to read others' feelings.	1	2	3	4
5.	At times I have wished that something bad would happen to someone I disliked.	1	2	3	4
6.	When I do something for others, I expect something in return.	1	2	3	4
7.	I wish I never had to work another day in the field of education.	1	2	3	4
8.	I'm usually the first to offer help when someone needs something.	1	2	3	4
9.	I prefer using technical skills in my job rather than personal skills.	1	2	3	4
10.	I have sometimes taken unfair advantage of another person.	1	2	3	4
11.	If bothers me that some students don't receive the education they deserve.	1	2	3	4
12.	I genuinely enjoy my profession.	1	2	3	4
13.	It is important for students to know that the teacher cares about them.	1	2	3	4
14.	My goal is to complete a task as quickly as possible without wasting time on conversation.	1	2	3	4
15.	I would never think of letting someone be punished for my wrongdoing.	1	2	3	4
16.	Most errors made when working with students are not important enough to report.	1	2	3	4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		SD	D	A	SA
17.	I find little enthusiasm for working as a teacher.	1	2	3	4
18.	I would delay personal plans in order to help someone who needs assistance.	1	2	3	4
19.	I don't particularly enjoy finding out about other people.	1	2	3	4
20.	I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	1	2	3	4
21.	I am not very tolerant of those whose ideas are different from my own.	1	2	3	4
22.	I would continue to work in education even if I didn't need the money.	1	2	3	4
23.	I have patience with individuals when they become emotionally upset.	1	2	3	4
24.	People should be able to deal with their own problems without depending upon others.	1	2	3	4
25.	I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	1	2	3	4
26.	Teachers should protect the rights of those who don't speak for themselves.	1	2	3	4
27.	I can't imagine enjoying any profession as much as teaching.	1	2	3	4
28.	I would intervene if I saw a student being mistreated by a coworker.	1	2	3	4
29.	I usually try to avoid becoming involved in students' problems.	1	2	3	4
30.	Preserving a student's dignity is as important as teaching the student something.	1	2	3	4
31.	Most days I don't look forward to going to work.	1	2	3	4
32.	I am bothered when I can't honor a commitment.	1	2	3	4
33.	When someone is in trouble, I try not to become involved.	1	2	3	4
34.	People often tell me their troubles.	1	2	3	4
35.	Maintaining eye contact is important when communicating with others.	1	2	3	4
36.	I don't find teaching much of a challenge	1	2	3	4
37.	I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	1	2	3	4
38.	It is hard for me to see someone who is upset and not offer to help.	1	2	3	4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART 2

DIRECTIONS: The items below describe factors/events/conditions in your school that can contribute to or en opportunities for your LEARNING as a professional. Use the scale provided below to rate each item. Cir number to the right of the item that corresponds to your rating of the frequency of occurrence factor/event/condition in your school.

SCALE:
1 = factor/event/condition does not occur/exist
2 = factor/event/condition sometimes occurs/exists
3 = factor/event/condition usually occurs/exists
4 = factor/event/condition almost always occurs/exists

	Factor/Event/Condition	Frequency of Occurrence/Existe			
1.	Open discussion of important teaching and learning issues in faculty meetings	1	2	3	4
2.	Collaboration between teachers and administrators regarding plans of action for teaching and learning	1	2	3	4
3.	Small group instructional meeting initiated by teachers	1	2	3	4
4.	Opportunities for teachers to observe in other teachers' classrooms	1	2	3	4
5.	Opportunities for administrators to observe in classrooms	1	2	3	4
6.	Opportunities for self-reflection to improve teaching and learning	1	2	3	4
7.	Opportunities for cooperative exchanges with other schools (e.g., cross-visiting, teacher networking, etc.)	1	2	3	4
8.	Opportunities for use of professional resources (e.g., teacher experts, guest speakers, etc.)	1	2	3	4
9.	Opportunities for teachers to participate in decisions concerning hiring of professional staff	1	2	3	4
10.	Opportunities for participation in professional activities (e.g., attending conferences, workshops, grant writing, collaborative action research, etc.)	1	2	3	4
11.	Opportunities for receiving incentives/rewards for developing creative or innovative activities, programs, etc.	1	2	3	4
12.	Opportunities for participation on school committees	1	2	3	4
13.	Opportunities for review of current literature in education (e.g., educational periodicals, journals, etc.)	1	2	3	4
14.	Opportunities (specific times scheduled) to work/plan collaboratively with other teachers	1	2	3	4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCALE: 1 = factor/event/condition does not occur/exist
2 = factor/event/condition sometimes occurs/exists
3 = factor/event/condition usually occurs/exists
4 = factor/event/condition almost always occurs/exists

Factor/Event/Condition		Frequency of Occurrence/Exis			
15.	Teachers provide suggestions to each other for improving teaching and learning	1	2	3	4
16.	Teachers make sacrifices to accomplish visions or goals of the school	1	2	3	4
17.	Teachers hold high expectations for student learning	1	2	3	4
18.	School activities focus on the quality of teaching and learning for students	1	2	3	4
19.	Teachers can decide to use teaching methods that work best for students	1	2	3	4
20.	Administrators hold high expectations for student learning	1	2	3	4
21.	Teachers can use their own judgement in establishing the pattern of daily classrooom activities	1	2	3	4
22.	Teachers emphasize professionalism	1	2	3	4
23.	Administrators and teachers cooperatively participate in developing school policies	1	2	3	4
24.	Teachers are open and receptive to new ideas	1	2	3	4
25.	Teachers make decisions concerning school activities	1	2	3	4
26.	Administrators and teachers discuss ways to accomplish or adjust school goals	1	2	3	4
27.	Administrators are open and receptive to teacher ideas	1	2	3	4
28.	Teachers make decisions concerning their own classes	1	2	3	4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART 3

DIRECTIONS: As you answer the questions on this assessment form, consider the following four goals that teachers usually attempt to accomplish in their roles as professionals in school environments. The four goals are:

GOAL 1: TO ENHANCE THE LEARNING OF STUDENTS

GOAL 2: TO INCREASE THE INVOLVEMENT OF PARENTS IN THEIR CHILDREN'S LEARNING

GOAL 3: TO ESTABLISH AND COMMUNICATE A VISION OF WHAT THE SCHOOL OUGHT TO ACCOMPLISH

GOAL 4: TO ESTABLISH PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ADMINISTRATORS AND OTHER TEACHERS

Three key questions are asked about each of the four goals in the sections below. First, read the key question, then consider each of the four goals listed, one at a time. Next, decide how you as an individual teacher would respond to the question; then decide how most teachers in your school would respond. Use the scale provided and circle the number that corresponds to your answers to the key question for each of the four goals. Repeat this procedure for each key question.

Key Question 1: How much energy/effort is put forth in your school to accomplish each goal?	Little or None		Some		A Large Amount
a. Goal 1: To enhance the learning of students					
My Effort	1	2	3	4	5
Efforts of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
b. Goal 2: To increase the involvement of parents in their children's learning					
My Effort	1	2	3	4	5
Efforts of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
c. Goal 3: To establish and communicate a vision of what the school ought to accomplish					
My Effort	1	2	3	4	5
Efforts of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
d. Goal 4: To establish professional relationships with administrators and other teachers					
My Effort	1	2	3	4	5
Efforts of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Question 2: If there are difficult or uncertain obstacles to overcome in accomplishing a goal, how much persistence/perseverance would be put forth to accomplish a goal?	Little or None		Some		A Large Amount
a. Goal 1: To enhance the learning of students					
My Persistence	1	2	3	4	5
Persistence of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
b. Goal 2: To increase the involvement of parents in their children's learning					
My Persistence	1	2	3	4	5
Persistence of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
c. Goal 3: To establish and communicate a vision of what the school ought to accomplish					
My Persistence	1	2	3	4	5
Persistence of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
d. Goal 4: To establish professional relationships with administrators and other teachers					
My Persistence	1	2	3	4	5
Persistence of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5

Key Question 3: To what extent would failure to accomplish a goal result in decreasing effort to accomplish future goals?					
a. Goal 1: To enhance the learning of students					
My Effort	1	2	3	4	5
Efforts of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
b. Goal 2: To increase the involvement of parents in their children's learning					
My Effort	1	2	3	4	5
Efforts of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		Little or None		Some		A Large Amount
c.	Goal 3: To establish and communicate a vision of what the school ought to accomplish					
	My Effort	1	2	3	4	5
	Efforts of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Goal 4: To establish professional relationships with administrators and other teachers					
	My Effort	1	2	3	4	5
	Efforts of Other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE